

REMARKS

By paper mailed 29 October 2009, the Office asserts that Applicants' papers filed 07 July 2009, although a *bona fide* attempt to advance prosecution, were not fully responsive to the Office Action mailed 04 June 2009. The Office asserts that Applicants did not respond to all rejections. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants attach a print-out from the public PAIR record for the instant Application showing that a paper other than a Terminal Disclaimer was entered 07 July 2009. Applicants also attach a copy of a return post card that accompanied applicants papers mailed 01 July 2009, noting that a Response with Terminal Disclaimer accompanied the post card. The card bears a stamp from the Office dated July 2, 2009.

Applicants further attach a copy of the Rule 111 Reply ("Response") that accompanied the post card. Mindful that false or misleading statements may jeopardize the validity or enforceability of any patent maturing from the instant Application, Applicants aver that the copy of the Rule 111 Reply is a true copy of the paper mailed 01 July 2009.

Applicants respectfully submit that no fee is due with this paper. If in fact a fee is due, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

and,

By John B. Starr, Jr.
John B. Starr, Jr., Ph.D
Reg. No. 44,474
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340